

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

BRENDA SZALANSKI, on behalf of herself,  
individually, and on behalf of all others  
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MIKE ARNOLD, LEA GEREND, PHIL  
TROIA, MIKE WHALEY and  
GREATBANC TRUST COMPANY,

Defendants, and

PDQ FOOD STORES, INC. EMPLOYEE  
STOCK OWNERSHIP PLAN,

Nominal Defendant.

Case No.: 19-cv-940-wmc

**DEFENDANT GREATBANC TRUST COMPANY'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), Defendant GreatBanc Trust Company (“GreatBanc”) moves to dismiss Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint (the “Motion”).

The Amended Complaint alleges that GreatBanc violated ERISA because it followed the ESOP participants’ direction and voted the shares of the PDQ ESOP in favor of PDQ’s October 2017 asset sale to Kwik Trip, Inc. (“Kwik Trip”) (the “Transaction”), despite three so-called “side payments” to the Individual Defendants. Specifically, Plaintiff brings claims against GreatBanc under ERISA section 406(a)(1)(D) (Count I) and ERISA section 404(a)(1) (Count III) based on the following:

- 1) PDQ’s payment of \$4.96 million to the Individual Defendants owed under a Stock Appreciation Rights Plan (the “SARs Plan”) and Grant Agreements that were established and unchanged since 2009—eight years before the Transaction (the “2009 SARS Plan Payment”).
- 2) an enhancement to the Transaction price that provided an additional payment from Kwik Trip of up to \$1.85 million to PDQ (and the ESOP) and up to \$1.85 million

to the Individual Defendants if the Individual Defendants successfully negotiated long-term leases or purchases of select properties on behalf of Kwik Trip after the Transaction (the “Lease Incentive”).

- 3) severance payments to approximately thirty management-level PDQ employees, who were not expected to be retained by Kwik Trip (the “Severance Payments”).

The Amended Complaint fails to state any claim against GreatBanc based on the fact the Transaction included these three deal points. As fully set forth in GreatBanc’s accompanying Memorandum in Support, the Amended Complaint fails to plausibly allege that GreatBanc violated ERISA section 406 (Count I) or ERISA section 404 (Count III). Accordingly, the Court should dismiss the Amended Complaint with prejudice.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael L. Scheier

Michael L. Scheier (Ohio 0055512)

Brian P. Muething (Ohio 0076315)

Jacob D. Rhode (Ohio 0089636)

Matthew J. Slovin (Ohio 0102029)

KEATING MUETHING & KLEKAMP PLL

One E. 4th Street, Suite 1400

Cincinnati, OH 45202

Tel: (513) 579-6400

Fax: (513) 579-6457

mscheier@kmklaw.com

bmuething@kmklaw.com

jrhode@kmklaw.com

mslovin@kmklaw.com

**GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.**

Todd G. Smith (#1022380)

One East Main Street, Suite 500

Madison, WI 53701-2719

Phone: 608-284-2653

Fax: 608-257-0609

tsmith@gklaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendant GreatBanc Trust Company*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on February 6, 2023, I caused true and correct copies of the foregoing to be filed electronically using the Court's CM/ECF system and to thereby be served upon all registered participants identified in the Notice of Electronic Filing in this matter on this date. This document is available for viewing and downloading on the CM/ECF system.

/s/ Michael L. Scheier

Michael L. Scheier